

REMARKS

I. Introduction.

Claims 1-37 are pending, and stand rejected. The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Claims 1-37 were, in various groups, rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a).

II. The Objection to the Drawings.

The Office Action indicates that a purifying device and the spraying device attached to a hose, wherein water is passed through the hose into the purifying device and then sprayed by the spraying device must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from Claims 11-14 and 16-17. The Office Action states that the positioning of the purifying device with respect to the sprayer head in the previously proposed informal drawing figure is not supported by the specification as originally filed.

The Applicants do not understand the basis for the rejection. The Office Action does not state how the positioning of the purifying device is not properly shown, only that it purportedly is not supported by the specification as filed. The proposed drawing figure shows exactly what is described in Claims 11-14 and 16-17 as filed, which form part of the specification. The proposed drawing figure shows the structure described in the paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 40 of the specification. The proposed drawing figure also shows exactly what the Examiner requested to be shown – “a purifying device and the spraying device attached to a hose, wherein water is passed through the hose into the purifying device and then sprayed by the spraying device”.

The Applicants respectfully request that this objection be reconsidered and the informal drawing figure be approved. If this is not done, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide more specific details as to how the positioning of the purifying device should be shown.

III. The 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections.

A. The Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15, 18-23, 25, and 32-37.

Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15, 18-23, 25, and 32-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,759,980 issued to Russo, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,502,215 issued to Cahan.

The Office Action states that Russo, et al. teach a method of cleaning a car using an aqueous cleaning composition having a pH less than 9 and containing a polymer which

renders the surface hydrophilic. The Office Action further states that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Russo, et al. to include using an ion exchange resin in car washes as taught by Cahan, et al. for the purposes of purifying the water by removing the water hardness.

The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The combination of references fails to teach or disclose, or render obvious a process in which the rinsing step is carried out using a hand-held sprayer that comprises a water purifier to rinse the surface with purified rinse water.

①
Tough
Thompson

B. The Rejection of Claims 5-7, 24, and 26-29.

Claims 5-7, 24, and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,502,215 issued to Cahan, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application 2002/0160924 filed in the name of Betrem, et al.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Office Action does not establish that the Betrem, et al. reference is prior art against the pending application. The Betrem, et al. reference published on October 31, 2002. The pending application claims the benefit of a PCT international patent application filed on June 14, 2000. Unless this rejection is withdrawn, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner state which paragraph of 35 U.S.C. Section 102 under which the Betrem, et al. reference is considered to be prior art.

②
Section
Filing Date

C. The Rejection of Claim 10.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,502,215 issued to Cahan, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,238,595 issued to Crutcher, et al.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The combination of references fails to teach or disclose, or render obvious a process in which the rinsing step is carried out using a hand-held sprayer that comprises a water purifier to rinse the surface with purified rinse water.

③
Thompson

D. The Rejection of Claims 13 and 31.

Claims 13 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,502,215 issued to Cahan, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,284,124 issued to DiMasicio, et al.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The combination of references fails to teach or disclose, or render obvious a process in which the rinsing step is carried out using a hand-held sprayer that comprises a water purifier to rinse the surface with purified rinse water. *Thompson*

E. The Rejection of Claims 16-17 and 30.

Claims 16-17 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,502,215 issued to Cahan, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,595,345 issued to Chura, et al.


The Office Action states that Russo, et al. teach that the car wash cleaning composition can be applied by spray bottle, but that Russo, et al. fail to teach the limitations of Claims 16-17 and 30. The Office Action goes on to state that Chura, et al. teach a double barrel sprayer for applying a dilute product of the cleaning solution to the surface and rinsing the surface with a water only rinse. The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method of Russo, et al. to include the double barrel sprayer of Chura, et al., for purposes of applying a cleaning solution and rinse onto the surface in a convenient manner.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. None of the references teach or disclose a hand-held sprayer that comprises a water purifier. The combination of references fails to teach or disclose, or render obvious a process in which the rinsing step is carried out using a hand-held sprayer that comprises a water purifier to rinse the surface with purified rinse water. *Thompson*

VI. Summary.

The Applicants have traversed the objections to the drawing. The 35 U.S.C. Section 103 rejections have been addressed. In view of the foregoing, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BRUCE BARGER, ET AL.

By 
Jeffrey V. Bamber
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,148
(513) 627-4597

August 28, 2003
Customer No. 27752
CM2373 Amendment 8-2003.doc

OFFICIAL

FAX RECEIVED
AUG 28 2003
TC 1700